

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicant submits replacement Sheet Nos. 1-3 containing Figures 1-5.

## REMARKS

### 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 29, 31-32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner specifically refers to claims 29 and 31 that recite the limitation "stitching" in line 1 of each claim. These claims have been cancelled without prejudice.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritchey in view of Moezzi. Claims 4-10 and 12-34 have been cancelled. The independent claims that remain pending are claims 1 and 35. Applicant submits that these claims and their dependencies are patentable over Ritchey in view of Moezzi.

The Examiner states as follows on Page 7:

*Regarding claim 18, the Ritchey method, now incorporating the Moezzi stitching process of warped images, has comprising selecting a presentation style for the combined image (Ritchey: column 29, lines 30-63), as in the claim.*

Ritchey, in column 29, lines 28-31, states as follows:

*The display units display adjacent portions of the model 26a1 of the world model 14a, such that a substantially continuous stereographic, autostereographic, or holographic scene 71 is rendered before the participants eyes.*

The following section elaborates on stereographic imaging. After considering the aforementioned section in Ritchey, it appears that the section states the rendering of "continuous stereographic, autostereographic, or holographic" scenes. Applicant believes that the cited section discloses a selection of the type of image being generated rather than a selection of presentation style for an image. A discussion in relation to "presentation style" is provided in paragraph [0056] of the present application as published. Thus, "presentation style" as discussed is distinctly different from the claimed invention and should not be deemed to teach the invention as claimed.

Support for the amendments for claims 1 and 35 may be found in paragraph [0056] of the present application as published. Claims 2-3, 11, and 36-38 depend from either claim 1 or claim 35 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 35.

Finally, Applicant would like to point out that the International Preliminary Report on Patentability (IPRP) for the corresponding PCT application that was issued by the Australian Patent Office is also favourable in relation to a nearly identical set of claims (as per the present set of claims as amended). A copy of the IPRP is attached for the reference of the Examiner. It should be noted that the documents cited against the corresponding PCT application were furnished in an Information Disclosure Statement and have all been considered by the Examiner.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3, 11, and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritchey in view of Moezzi.

New Claims 39-45


New claims 39-45 have been added. These claims depend from claim 35, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 35.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen M. De Klerk at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Stephen M. De Klerk  
Reg. No. 46,503

Date: September 14, 2006

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300